



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/684,281

10/10/2003

Reid F. Hayhow

10030552-1

3341

63448

7590

04/21/2008

VERIGY, LTD.

IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT

10100 N. TANTAU AVENUE

CUPERTINO, CA 95014-2540

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/684,281	Applicant(s) HAYHOW, REID F.	
	Examiner Jalatee Worjloh	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed January 23, 2008. Claims 14-25 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed January 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues that Organ discloses not mention or implies that “rules checking” includes license checking.

In response the Examiner notes that a recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art, if the prior art has the capability to so perform. (see MPEP 2114 and *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)). Claim 14 recites *logic*, communicatively coupled to the tester, to *enable* one or more resources of the tester according to one or more properties of an electronic license. Organ's tester performs allocation and rules checking. The Examiner notes that the tester of Organ is capable of checking any type of rules including electronic license. Thus, “the recitation of a new intended use of an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable”. *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Functional recitation(s) using the word “for” or other functional language (*e.g.* “logic to”) have been considered but are given little patentable weight¹ because they fail to add any structural limitations and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed product must

¹ See *e.g. In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(stating that

Art Unit: 3621

result in a structural difference between the claimed product and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed product from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it reads on the claimed limitation. *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) (“The manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself.”); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See also MPEP §§ 2114 and 2115. Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the claim interpretation principles in this paragraph apply to all examined claims currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7191368 to Organ et al. (“Organ”).

Referring to claim 14, Organ discloses a tester to apply to one or more testes to a device (see abstract – an electronic tester; a test head is coupled to a device under test), logic, communicatively coupled to the tester, to enable one or more resources of the tester according to one or more properties of an electronic license (i.e. rule) (see col. 12, lines 4-6) and to create at least one log file having resources use information for one or more tests executed on the tester (see col. 14, lines 46-50).

Referring to claims 15-18, Organ discloses the system wherein the logic is to enable an amount of memory available on the tester according to one of the properties of the electronic license (i.e. attribute), to enable a speed available on the tester (i.e. timing information)

although all limitations must be considered, not all limitations are entitled to patentable weight).

Art Unit: 3621

according to one of the properties of the electronic license, to enable a number of waveforms available on the tester according to one of the properties of the electronic license and to enable a number of edge transactions available on the tester (i.e. attribute) according to one of the properties of the electronic license (see col. 12, lines 4-8).

Referring to claim 19, Organ discloses the tester comprises a system-on-a-chip tester (see abstract, lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 20-25, Organ discloses at least one log file having resource use information for one or more tests executed on the tester comprises at least one log file having resources use information for one or more tests executed on the device tester using the electronic license, wherein the logic is to generate a usage based on the at least one log file (see claim 14 above). Organ does not expressly disclose the use information including the amount of time the tester is used, information on amount of memory used by the tester during testing of the device is maximum amount of memory used by the tester over a predefined period of time, on a speed at which tests are executed by the tester. However, this difference is only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in process. The process of creating the log file would be performed the same regardless of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a log file including any type of data because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is 571-272-6714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on 571-272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jalatee Worjloh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3621